

Remarks

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 27-46 are pending in the application. Claims 27, 35, and 41 are independent. Claims 1-26 have been cancelled. Claims 27-46 have been added. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

Statutory Double Patenting

Claims 1-26 have been provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-26 of co-pending Application No. 10/732,837. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-26 in this Application are hereby cancelled and new claims 27-46 have been added. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 8, 9, and 19 have been objected to because of minor informalities. These claims have been cancelled. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections be removed.

Patentability of Claims 27-46 over Chapel, Kern, and Arato under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 27-46 are patentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,628,009 to Chapel (“Chapel”), U.S. Patent No. 6,157,552 to Kern et al. (“Kern”), and U.S. Patent 4,528,497 to Arato (“Arato”), individually or in combination.

Claim 27

Independent claim 27 recites “with at least one of the plurality of power information monitors disposed in the power distribution apparatus, reporting power information regarding the first power phase distributed by the at least a first of the plurality of polyphase power outputs.” Applicant respectfully submits that Chapel does not teach or suggest any power information monitors of any type, much less of the type claimed or within the environment of the monitors claimed, as noted in the Office Action at Page 4. Thus, Chapel does not teach or suggest

anything relating to power information monitors, much less with at least one of the plurality of power information monitors disposed in the power distribution apparatus, reporting power information regarding the first power phase distributed by the at least a first of the plurality of polyphase power outputs, as recited by independent claim 27.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kern also does not disclose, much less teach, any such subject matter. For example, Figure 8 of Kern and the corresponding discussion at col. 6, lines 34-41 (as noted in the Office Action) are understood to merely describe a GUI (graphical user interface) 800 that displays the results of a SH2 level test. Kern does not, however, describe anything relating to power information monitors, much less, with at least one of the plurality of power information monitors disposed in the power distribution apparatus, reporting power information regarding the first power phase distributed by the at least a first of the plurality of polyphase power outputs, as recited by independent claim 27.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Arato does not disclose, much less teach, any such subject matter. For example, Arato is understood to describe at col. 3, lines 52-55, certain audible and visual alarms (as noted in the Office Action). Arato does not, however, describe anything relating to power information monitors, much less, with at least one of the plurality of power information monitors disposed in the power distribution apparatus, reporting power information regarding the first power phase distributed by the at least a first of the plurality of polyphase power outputs, as recited by independent claim 27.

Therefore, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 27. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 28

Dependent claim 28 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 27 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 27. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of distributing polyphase alternating current power “further comprising, with at least a second of the plurality of power information monitors, reporting power information

regarding the second power phase distributed by the at least a second of the plurality of polyphase power outputs,” which is recited by dependent claim 28. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 29

Dependent claim 29 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 27 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 27. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of distributing polyphase alternating current power “wherein the reporting power information regarding the first power phase comprises determining current of the first power phase,” which is recited by dependent claim 29. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 30

Dependent claim 30 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 27 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 27. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of distributing polyphase alternating current power “wherein the reporting power information regarding the second power phase comprises determining current of the second power phase,” which is recited by dependent claim 30. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 31

Dependent claim 31 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 27 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 27. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of distributing polyphase alternating current power “further comprising, with at least a third of the plurality of polyphase power outputs, distributing a third power phase received by the polyphase power input,” which is recited by dependent claim 31. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 32

Dependent claim 32 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 27 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 27. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of distributing polyphase alternating current power “further comprising, with at least a third of the plurality of power information monitors, reporting power information regarding the third power phase distributed by the at least a third of the plurality of polyphase power outputs,” which is recited by dependent claim 32. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 33

Dependent claim 33 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 27 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 27. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of distributing polyphase alternating current power “wherein the reporting power information regarding the third power phase comprises determining current of the third power phase,” which is recited by dependent claim 33. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 34

Dependent claim 34 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 27 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 27. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of distributing polyphase alternating current power “further comprising, with at least one of the plurality of power information monitors, providing a sensory alarm, whereby a human in the vicinity of the power distribution apparatus may receive sensory stimulation from the sensory alarm,” which is recited by dependent claim 34. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 35

Independent claim 35 recites “transmitting the analog signal to the digital display module disposed in the three-phase delta power distribution and monitoring apparatus.” Applicant respectfully submits that Chapel does not teach or suggest any digital display module of any type, much less of the type claimed or within the environment of the digital display module claimed, as noted in the Office Action at Page 4. Therefore, Chapel does not teach or suggest anything relating to a digital display module, much less transmitting the analog signal to the digital display module disposed in the three-phase delta power distribution and monitoring apparatus, as recited by independent claim 35.

Applicant respectfully submits that also Kern does not disclose, much less teach, any such subject matter. For example, Figure 8 of Kern and the corresponding discussion at col. 6, lines 34-41 (as noted in the Office Action) are understood to merely describe a GUI (graphical user interface) 800 that displays the results of a SH2 level test. Kern does not, however, describe anything relating to a digital display module, much less transmitting the analog signal to the digital display module disposed in the three-phase delta power distribution and monitoring apparatus, as recited by independent claim 35.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Arato does not disclose, much less teach, any such subject matter. For example, Arato is understood to describe at col. 3, lines 52-55, certain audible and visual alarms (as noted in the Office Action). Arato does not, however, describe

anything relating to a digital display module, much less transmitting the analog signal to the digital display module disposed in the three-phase delta power distribution and monitoring apparatus, as recited by independent claim 35.

Therefore, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 35. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 36

Dependent claim 36 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 35 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 35. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of polyphase power distribution “further comprising generating an alarm when the analog signal meets at least one specified criteria,” which is recited by dependent claim 36. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 37

Dependent claim 37 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 35 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 35. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of polyphase power distribution “wherein generating an alarm comprises generating an audible alarm that can be heard by a user within the vicinity of the three-phase delta power distribution and monitoring apparatus,” which is recited by dependent claim 37. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 38

Dependent claim 38 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 35 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 35. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of polyphase power distribution “further comprising converting in each of the plurality of power supplies alternating current to direct current,” which is recited by dependent claim 38. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 39

Dependent claim 39 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 35 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 35. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of polyphase power distribution “wherein the sensing comprises using a current-sensing transducer,” which is recited by dependent claim 39. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 40

Dependent claim 40 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 35 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 35. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of polyphase power distribution “further comprising converting an analog output from the current-sensing transducer to a digital output,” which is recited by dependent claim 40. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 41

Independent claim 41 recites “transmitting the analog signal to one of the plurality of digital display modules disposed in the three-phase wye power distribution and monitoring apparatus.” Applicant respectfully submits that Chapel does not teach or suggest any digital display modules of any type, much less of the type claimed or within the environment of the digital display modules claimed, as noted in the Office Action at Page 4. Therefore, Chapel does not teach or suggest anything relating to digital display modules, much less transmitting the analog signal to one of the plurality of digital display modules disposed in the three-phase wye power distribution and monitoring apparatus, as recited by independent claim 41.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kern also does not disclose, much less teach, any such subject matter. For example, Figure 8 of Kern and the corresponding discussion at col. 6, lines 34-41 (as noted in the Office Action) are understood to merely describe a GUI (graphical user interface) 800 that displays the results of a SH2 level test. Kern does not, however, describe anything relating to digital display modules, much less transmitting the analog signal to one of the plurality of digital display modules disposed in the three-phase wye power distribution and monitoring apparatus, as recited by independent claim 41.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Arato does not disclose, much less teach, any such subject matter. For example, Arato is understood to describe at col. 3, lines 52-55, certain audible and visual alarms (as noted in the Office Action). Arato does not, however, describe anything relating to digital display modules, much less transmitting the analog signal to one of the plurality of digital display modules disposed in the three-phase wye power distribution and monitoring apparatus, as recited by independent claim 41.

Therefore, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 41. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 42

Dependent claim 42 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 41 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 41. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of polyphase power distribution “further comprising generating an alarm when the analog signal meets at least one specified criteria,” which is recited by dependent claim 42. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 43

Dependent claim 43 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 41 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 41. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of polyphase power distribution “wherein generating an alarm comprises generating an audible alarm that can be heard by a user within the vicinity of the three-phase delta power distribution and monitoring apparatus,” which is recited by dependent claim 43. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 44

Dependent claim 44 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 41 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 41. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of polyphase power distribution “further comprising converting in the neutral power supply alternating current to direct current,” which is recited by dependent claim 44. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 45

Dependent claim 45 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 41 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 41. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of polyphase power distribution “wherein the sensing comprises using a current-sensing transducer,” which is recited by dependent claim 45. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Claim 46

Dependent claim 46 depends directly or indirectly from parent claim 41 and is allowable for at least the reasons recited above in support of parent claim 41. It is also independently patentable.

For example, Chapel, Kern, and Arato, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a method of polyphase power distribution “further comprising converting an analog output from the current-sensing transducer to a digital output,” which is recited by dependent claim 46. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion to combine the references much less in a fashion that would yield the claimed subject matter.

Request for Examiner Interview

The Examiner is formally requested to contact the undersigned attorney to arrange for an Examiner Interview. This request is being submitted under MPEP § 713.01, which indicates that an interview may be arranged in advance by a written request.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims in their present form should be allowed. Early favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By) /s/ Justin D. Wagner
Justin D. Wagner
Registration No. 54,519